

**U.S. District Court  
California Northern District (San Francisco)  
CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 3:05-cv-03197-MHP**

Uwakwe v. Intel Corporation  
Assigned to: Hon. Marilyn H. Patel  
Demand: \$0  
Cause: 15:2 Antitrust Litigation

Date Filed: 08/08/2005  
Jury Demand: None  
Nature of Suit: 410 Anti-Trust  
Jurisdiction: Federal Question

**Plaintiff**

**Athan Uwakwe**  
*individually, and on behalf of all those  
similarly situated  
doing business as  
Tom Cyp Computers*

represented by **Donald Chidi Amamgbo, Esq.**  
Amamgbo & Associates, APC  
1940 Embarcadero Cove  
Oakland, CA 94606  
510-434-7800  
Fax: 510-434-7804  
Email: DonaldAmamgbo@Citycom.com  
**LEAD ATTORNEY**  
**ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED**

**Daniel Etoh**  
Amamgbo & Associates, APC  
1940 Embarcadero  
Oakland, CA 94606  
510/434-7800  
Fax: 510/434-7804  
**ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED**

**Nick Agbo**  
Amamgbo & Associates, APC  
1940 Embarcadero  
Oakland, CA 94606  
510/434-7800  
Fax: 510/434-7804  
**ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED**

**Reginald Von Terrell, Esq.**  
THE TERRELL LAW GROUP  
223 25th Street  
Richmond, CA 94804  
510/237-9700  
Fax: 510/237-4616  
Email: REGGIET2@AOL.COM  
**ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED**

**Remigius Chibueze, Esq.**  
Amamgbo & Associates, APC  
1940 Embarcadero  
Oakland, CA 94606  
510-434-7800  
Fax: 510-434-7804  
Email: rochibueze@yahoo.com  
**ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED**

V.

**Defendant****Intel Corporation**represented by **Joy K. Fuyuno**

Bingham McCutchen LLP

Three Embarcadero Center

San Francisco, CA 94111-4067

415-393-2000

Fax: 415-393-2286

Email: joy.fuyuno@bingham.com

**ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED**

Date Filed	#	Docket Text
08/08/2005	<a href="#">1</a>	CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT For Violation of Antitrust Act, Violation of Cartwright Act & Violation of Unfair Competition Laws & Demand for Jury Trial - [Summons Issued] against Intel Corporation, [Filing Fee: \$250.00, Receipt Number 4411418]. Filed by Plaintiff Athan Uwakwe. (tn, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 8/8/2005) (Entered: 08/10/2005)
08/08/2005		SUMMONS Issued as to Intel Corporation. (tn, COURT STAFF) (Entered: 08/10/2005)
08/08/2005	<a href="#">2</a>	ADR SCHEDULING ORDER: Case Management Statement due 12/5/2005 & Initial Case Management Conference set for 12/12/2005 04:00 PM. (Attachments: # <a href="#">1</a> Standing Order). (tn, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 8/8/2005) (Entered: 08/10/2005)
08/08/2005	<a href="#">3</a>	ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION to Consider Whether Cases Should be Related Filed by Plaintiff Athan Uwakwe. (tn, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 8/8/2005) (Entered: 08/10/2005)
08/08/2005	<a href="#">4</a>	DECLARATION of Reginald Terrell in Support of Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Cases Should Be Related re [3]. Filed by Plaintiff Athan Uwakwe. (Related document(s)[3]).(tn, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 8/8/2005) (Entered: 08/10/2005)
08/08/2005		CASE DESIGNATED for Electronic Filing. (tn, COURT STAFF) (Entered: 08/10/2005)
08/12/2005	<a href="#">5</a>	ORDER OF RECUSAL. Magistrate Judge Bernard Zimmerman recused.. Signed by Magistrate Judge Bernard Zimmerman on 8/12/2005. (bzsec, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 8/12/2005) (Entered: 08/12/2005)
08/12/2005		Cases associated. (gba, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 8/12/2005) (Entered: 08/18/2005)
08/16/2005	<a href="#">6</a>	ORDER RELATING CASE to C 05-2669 MHP; Case reassigned to Judge Marilyn H. Patel for all further proceedings; Signed by Judge Marilyn Hall Patel on 8/12/2005. (awb, COURT-STAFF) (Filed on 8/16/2005) (Entered: 08/16/2005)
10/20/2005	<a href="#">7</a>	CLERK'S NOTICE re: Failure to E-File and/or Failure to Register as an E-Filer re: #1 Class Action Complaint, #3 Administrative Motion & #4 Declaration of Reginald Terrell. (gba, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 10/20/2005) (Entered: 10/20/2005)
11/01/2005	<a href="#">8</a>	STIPULATION AND <i>[PROPOSED]</i> ORDER TO STAY DATES, EVENTS AND DEADLINES PENDING THE OUTCOME OF THE MOTION TO TRANSFER AND COORDINATE OR CONSOLIDATE PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. SECTION 1407 by Intel Corporation. (Fuyuno, Joy) (Filed on 11/1/2005) (Entered: 11/01/2005)
11/08/2005	<a href="#">9</a>	STIPULATION AND ORDER STAYING CASE pending MDI determination; Signed by Judge Marilyn Hall Patel on 11/7/2005. (awb, COURT-STAFF) (Filed on 11/8/2005) (Entered: 11/08/2005)
11/17/2005	<a href="#">10</a>	Letter from Joy K. Fuyuno re MDL Transfer Order of November 8, 2005. (Attachments: #

		MDL Transfer Order (Fuyang, Joy) (Filed on 1/17/2005) (Entered: 1/17/2005)
01/05/2006	<a href="#">11</a>	ORDER STATISTICALLY DISMISSING CASE pending MDL determination; Signed by Judge Marilyn Hall Patel on 1/5/2006. (awb, COURT-STAFF) (Filed on 1/5/2006) (Entered: 01/05/2006)
01/10/2006	<a href="#">12</a>	ORDER of Transfer by the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation to transfer case to USDC for the District of Delaware (In Re Intel Corporation, Inc., Antitrust Litigation - MDL - 1717). (gba, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 1/10/2006) (Entered: 01/11/2006)
01/11/2006	<a href="#">13</a>	Certified copy of transfer order, docket sheet along with the original case file sent to USDC for the District of Delaware (MDL - 1717). (gba, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 1/11/2006) (Entered: 01/11/2006)

**PACER Service Center****Transaction Receipt**

01/18/2006 09:23:15

<b>PACER Login:</b>	ud0037	<b>Client Code:</b>	
<b>Description:</b>	Docket Report	<b>Search Criteria:</b>	3:05-cv-03197-MHP
<b>Billable Pages:</b>	2	<b>Cost:</b>	0.16

**DOCUMENT**

**WILL BE**

**PROVIDED**

**AT A LATER DATE**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

	)	
	)	
ATHAN UWAKWE	)	
Plaintiff(s)	)	
	)	C 05-03197 BZ
-v-	)	
	)	ORDER SETTING INITIAL CASE MANAGEMENT
INTEL CORPORATION	)	CONFERENCE
Defendant(s)	)	
	)	

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this action is assigned to the Honorable Bernard Zimmerman. When serving the complaint or notice of removal, the plaintiff or removing defendant must serve on all other parties a copy of this order, the handbook entitled "Dispute Resolution Procedures in the Northern District of California," the Notice of Assignment to United States Magistrate Judge for Trial, and all other documents specified in Civil Local Rule 4-2. Counsel must comply with the case schedule listed below unless the Court otherwise orders.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this action is assigned to the Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Multi-Option Program governed by ADR Local Rule 3. Counsel and clients must familiarize themselves with that rule and with the handbook entitled "Dispute Resolution Procedures in the Northern District of California."

CASE SCHEDULE [ADR MULTI-OPTION PROGRAM]

Date	Event	Governing Rule
08/08/2005	Complaint filed	
11/21/2005	Last day to meet and confer re initial disclosures, early settlement, ADR process selection, and discovery plan	FRCivP 26(f) & ADR LR 3-5
11/21/2005	Last day to file Joint ADR Certification with Stipulation to ADR process or Notice of Need for ADR Phone Conference	Civil L.R. 16-8
12/05/2005	Last day to complete initial disclosures or state objection in Rule 26(f) Report, file/serve Case Management Statement, and file/serve Rule 26(f) Report	FRCivP 26(a)(1) Civil L.R.16-9
12/12/2005	Case Management Conference in Ctrm G, 15th Floor, SF at 4:00 PM	Civil L.R. 16-10

## STANDING ORDERS

1. Within 30 days of filing a complaint, plaintiff shall serve and file either a written consent to Magistrate Judge Zimmerman's jurisdiction or a written request for reassignment to a district judge. Within 30 days of being served with a complaint or third party complaint, a defendant or third party defendant shall serve and file either a written consent to Magistrate Judge Zimmerman's jurisdiction or a written request for reassignment to a district judge.

2. Civil law and motion is heard on the first and third Wednesdays of every month at 10:00 a.m. Criminal law and motion is heard on the second and fourth Wednesdays of every month at 1:30 p.m.

3. A copy of any brief or other document containing a legal citation **shall** be submitted to chambers on a diskette formatted preferably in WordPerfect 5, 6, 8 or 9. A chambers copy of any document **may** be submitted on CD-ROM with hypertext links to exhibits.

4. Any proposed order in a case subject to electronic filing shall be sent by e-mail to: [bzpo@cand.uscourts.gov](mailto:bzpo@cand.uscourts.gov). This address is to be used only for proposed orders unless otherwise directed by the court.

5. Unless expressly requested by the Court, documents should **not be faxed** to chambers but should be filed or lodged in accordance with the Local Rules of Court. The Court should not be routinely copied on correspondence between counsel.

6. Motions for **summary judgment** shall be accompanied by a statement of the material facts not in dispute supported by citations to admissible evidence. The

1 parties shall file a joint statement of undisputed facts where possible. If the parties are  
2 unable to reach complete agreement after meeting and conferring, they shall file a joint  
3 statement of the undisputed facts about which they do agree. Any party may then file a  
4 separate statement of the additional facts that the party contends are undisputed. A  
5 party who without substantial justification contends that a fact is in dispute is subject to  
6 sanctions.

7  
8 7. Parties are reminded that most procedural questions are answered in the  
9 Local Rules or these Standing Orders. Parties should not contact Chambers for  
10 answers to procedural questions. The Local Rules are available for public viewing at  
11 the Court's internet site - <http://www.cand.uscourts.gov>.

12  
13  
14 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

15  
16 Dated: January 17, 2002

17  
18  
19 

---

BERNARD ZIMMERMAN  
United States Magistrate Judge  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

NO  
PDF  
FOR THIS  
EVENT



NO  
PDF  
FOR THIS  
EVENT

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ATHAN UWAKWE, dba TOM CYP)  
COMPUTERS, )

Plaintiff(s), )

v. )

INTEL CORPORATION, )


Defendant(s). )

No. C05-3197 BZ

**NOTICE OF RECUSAL**

I hereby recuse myself in the above action.

Dated: August 12, 2005



Bernard Zimmerman  
United States Magistrate Judge

G:\BZALL\BZCASES\MISC\UWAKWE.RECUSAL.wpd


**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

**RELATED CASE ORDER**

A Motion for Administrative Relief to Consider Whether Cases Should be Related or a *Sua Sponte* Judicial Referral for Purpose of Determining Relationship (Civil L.R. 3-12) has been filed. The time for filing an opposition or statement of support has passed. As the judge assigned to the earliest filed case below that bears my initials, I find that the more recently filed case(s) that I have initialed below are related to the case assigned to me, and such case(s) shall be reassigned to me. Any cases listed below that are not related to the case assigned to me are referred to the judge assigned to the next-earliest filed case for a related case determination.

C 05-02669 MHP      Lipton et al v. Intel Corporation

C 05-03197 BZ      Uwakwe v. Intel Corporation

I find that the above case is related to the case assigned to 

**ORDER**

Counsel are instructed that all future filings in any reassigned case are to bear the initials of the newly assigned judge immediately after the case number. Any case management conference in any reassigned case will be rescheduled by the Court. The parties shall adjust the dates for the conference, disclosures and report required by FRCivP 16 and 26 accordingly. Unless otherwise ordered, any dates for hearing noticed motions are vacated and must be re-noticed by the moving party before the newly assigned judge; any deadlines set by the ADR Local Rules remain in effect; and any deadlines established in a case management order continue to govern, except dates for appearance in court, which will be rescheduled by the newly assigned judge.

Dated: 8/12/05

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Judge Marilyn H. Patel

### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on the date stated below, I lodged a copy of this order with each judicial officer and I mailed a copy to each counsel of record or *pro se* party in the cases listed above.

Richard W. Wieking, Clerk

DATED: 8/16/2005

By: [Signature]

Deputy Clerk

Copies to: Courtroom Deputies  
Case Systems Administrators  
Counsel of Record  
Entered into Assignment Program: \_\_\_\_\_ (date)

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ATHAN UWAKWE

Plaintiff,

v.

INTEL CORPORATION  
Defendant.

NO. CV 05-03197 MHP

**CLERK'S NOTICE RE: FAILURE  
TO FILE ELECTRONICALLY  
AND/OR REGISTER AS AN E-  
FILER**

On 8/8/05, counsel for **Plaintiff** filed a **Class Action Complaint, Administrative Motion & Declaration of Reginald Terrell** manually, on paper. This case has been designated for electronic filing, pursuant to Local Rule 5-4 and General Order 45.


The above mentioned paper document has been filed and docketed. However, General Order 45 provides at Section III that cases assigned to judges who participate in the e-filing program "shall be presumptively designated" as e-filing cases. Therefore, counsel for **Plaintiff** should submit the **Above Documents**, in PDF format within 10 days, as an attachment in an **e-mail** message directed to the judges chamber's "PDF" email box listed at <http://ecf.cand.uscourts.gov>. (Click on the **Judges** button and follow the procedure listed there). Do **not** e-file a document which has been previously filed on paper, as is the case with the above mentioned filing. All subsequent papers should be e-filed.

Further, General Order 45 provides at Section IV (A) that "Each attorney of record is obligated to become

an ECF User and be assigned a user ID and password for access to the system upon designation of the action as being subject to ECF." Counsel in this case who have not yet registered as ECF Users must do so immediately. Forms and instructions for registering can be found on the Court's Web site at [ecf.cand.uscourts.gov](http://ecf.cand.uscourts.gov).

Dated: October 20, 2005

Gina Augustine-Rivas  
Deputy Clerk



BINGHAM McCUTCHEN LLP  
DAVID M. BALABANIAN (SBN 37368)  
CHRISTOPHER B. HOCKETT (SBN 121539)  
JOY K. FUYUNO (SBN 193890)  
Three Embarcadero Center  
San Francisco, CA 94111-4067  
Telephone: (415) 393-2000  
Facsimile: (415) 393-2286

Attorneys for Defendant  
Intel Corporation

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

ATHAN UWAKWE, d/b/a Tom Cyp  
Computers, individually and on behalf of all  
others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

INTEL CORPORATION, a Delaware  
corporation,

Defendant.

No. C-05-3197-MHP

**STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]  
ORDER TO STAY DATES, EVENTS  
AND DEADLINES PENDING THE  
OUTCOME OF THE MOTION TO  
TRANSFER AND COORDINATE OR  
CONSOLIDATE PURSUANT TO  
28 U.S.C. § 1407**

WHEREAS, on August 8, 2005, Plaintiff filed the instant action in the Northern District of California ("Uwakwe Action");

WHEREAS, on or about July 11, 2005, the plaintiffs in *Brauch, et al. v. Intel Corp.*, No. C 05-2743 (BZ) (N. D. Cal., filed July 5, 2005), a related matter, moved before the Judicial Panel on Multi-District Litigation ("MDL"), to transfer and coordinate or consolidate for pre-trial proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 407 ("MDL Motion"), and the Uwakwe Action has been identified as a related action subject to that motion;

WHEREAS, on or about August 12, 2005, Judge Patel issued a Related Case Order relating this case to an earlier filed case assigned to her, and canceling or staying certain but not all dates, events and deadlines in the action;

WHEREAS, to date, a decision has not been rendered on the MDL Motion;

WHEREAS, the outcome of the MDL Motion will impact significantly the schedule of this case;

THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED, pursuant to Civil Local Rule 6-2, by and among counsel for Plaintiff Uwakwe, and counsel for Defendant Intel Corporation, that any events, dates or deadlines set by the Local Rules or Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, including the Local Rules for Alternative Dispute Resolution (“ADR Local Rules”) and Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 16 and 26, and any deadlines established in any case management order applicable to this case should be stayed pending the outcome of the aforementioned MDL Motion; and

IT IS FURTHER STIPULATED by the aforementioned parties that if a case management conference is rescheduled by the Court, the parties shall adjust the dates for any conference, disclosures or reports required by the Local Rules or Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, including the ADR Local Rules and Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 16 and 26 accordingly.

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED.

Dated: November 1, 2005

AMAMGBO & ASSOCIATES, APC

By: C. Donald Amamgbo  
C. Donald Amamgbo  
Attorneys for Plaintiff  
Athan Uwakwe



Dated: November 1, 2005

BINGHAM McCUTCHEN LLP

By: Joy K. Fuyuno  
Joy K. Fuyuno  
Attorneys for Defendant  
Intel Corporation

**[PROPOSED] ORDER TO STAY DATES, EVENTS AND DEADLINES  
PENDING THE OUTCOME OF THE MDL MOTION**

Any events, dates or deadlines set by the Local Rules or Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, including the Local Rules for Alternative Dispute Resolution (“ADR Local Rules”) and Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 16 and 26, and any deadlines established in any case management order applicable to this case are hereby stayed pending the outcome of the motion to transfer and coordinate or consolidate pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407 (“MDL Motion”).

Upon the determination of the MDL Motion, if it is necessary for the Court to reschedule a case management conference, the parties shall adjust the dates for any conference, disclosures or reports required by the ADR Local Rules and Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 16 and 26 accordingly.

The parties shall notify the Clerk of Court within 10 days of the decision on the MDL Motion.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Honorable Marilyn H. Patel  
United States District Court Judge

FILED

NOV - 8 2005

RICHARD W. WIEKING  
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BINGHAM McCUTCHEN LLP  
DAVID M. BALABANIAN (SBN 37368)  
CHRISTOPHER B. HOCKETT (SBN 121539)  
JOY K. FUYUNO (SBN 193890)  
Three Embarcadero Center  
San Francisco, CA 94111-4067  
Telephone: (415) 393-2000  
Facsimile: (415) 393-2286

Attorneys for Defendant  
Intel Corporation

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

ATHAN UWAKWE, d/b/a Tom Cyp  
Computers, individually and on behalf of all  
others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

INTEL CORPORATION, a Delaware  
corporation,

Defendant.

No. C-05-3197-MHP

**STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]  
ORDER TO STAY DATES, EVENTS  
AND DEADLINES PENDING THE  
OUTCOME OF THE MOTION TO  
TRANSFER AND COORDINATE OR  
CONSOLIDATE PURSUANT TO  
28 U.S.C. § 1407**

WHEREAS, on August 8, 2005, Plaintiff filed the instant action in the Northern  
District of California ("Uwakwe Action");

WHEREAS, on or about July 11, 2005, the plaintiffs in *Brauch, et al. v. Intel  
Corp.*, No. C 05-2743 (BZ) (N. D. Cal., filed July 5, 2005), a related matter, moved before the  
Judicial Panel on Multi-District Litigation ("MDL"), to transfer and coordinate or consolidate for  
pre-trial proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 407 ("MDL Motion"), and the Uwakwe Action has  
been identified as a related action subject to that motion;

1 WHEREAS, on or about August 12, 2005, Judge Patel issued a Related Case  
2 Order relating this case to an earlier filed case assigned to her, and canceling or staying certain  
3 but not all dates, events and deadlines in the action;

4 WHEREAS, to date, a decision has not been rendered on the MDL Motion;

5 WHEREAS, the outcome of the MDL Motion will impact significantly the  
6 schedule of this case;

7 THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED, pursuant to Civil Local Rule 6-2,  
8 by and among counsel for Plaintiff Uwakwe, and counsel for Defendant Intel Corporation, that  
9 any events, dates or deadlines set by the Local Rules or Federal Rules of Civil Procedure,  
10 including the Local Rules for Alternative Dispute Resolution ("ADR Local Rules") and Federal  
11 Rules of Civil Procedure 16 and 26, and any deadlines established in any case management order  
12 applicable to this case should be stayed pending the outcome of the aforementioned MDL  
13 Motion; and

14 IT IS FURTHER STIPULATED by the aforementioned parties that if a case  
15 management conference is rescheduled by the Court, the parties shall adjust the dates for any  
16 conference, disclosures or reports required by the Local Rules or Federal Rules of Civil  
17 Procedure, including the ADR Local Rules and Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 16 and 26  
18 accordingly.

19 IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED.

20 Dated: November 1, 2005

AMAMGBO & ASSOCIATES, APC

21

22

By: C. Donald Amamgbo  
C. Donald Amamgbo  
Attorneys for Plaintiff  
Athan Uwakwe

23

24

25

26

1 Dated: November 1, 2005

BINGHAM McCUTCHEN LLP

2  
3 By: Joy K. Fuyuno  
4 Joy K. Fuyuno  
5 Attorneys for Defendant  
6 Intel Corporation  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

**[PROPOSED] ORDER TO STAY DATES, EVENTS AND DEADLINES  
PENDING THE OUTCOME OF THE MDL MOTION**

Any events, dates or deadlines set by the Local Rules or Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, including the Local Rules for Alternative Dispute Resolution ("ADR Local Rules") and Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 16 and 26, and any deadlines established in any case management order applicable to this case are hereby stayed pending the outcome of the motion to transfer and coordinate or consolidate pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407 ("MDL Motion").

Upon the determination of the MDL Motion, if it is necessary for the Court to reschedule a case management conference, the parties shall adjust the dates for any conference, disclosures or reports required by the ADR Local Rules and Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 16 and 26 accordingly.

The parties shall notify the Clerk of Court within 10 days of the decision on the MDL Motion.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: 11/7/05

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Honorable Marilyn H. Patel  
United States District Court Judge

FILED

NOV - 8 2005

RICHARD W. WIEKING  
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BINGHAM McCUTCHEN LLP  
DAVID M. BALABANIAN (SBN 37368)  
CHRISTOPHER B. HOCKETT (SBN 121539)  
JOY K. FUYUNO (SBN 193890)  
Three Embarcadero Center  
San Francisco, CA 94111-4067  
Telephone: (415) 393-2000  
Facsimile: (415) 393-2286

Attorneys for Defendant  
Intel Corporation

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

ATHAN UWAKWE, d/b/a Tom Cyp  
Computers, individually and on behalf of all  
others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

INTEL CORPORATION, a Delaware  
corporation,

Defendant.

No. C-05-3197-MHP

**STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]  
ORDER TO STAY DATES, EVENTS  
AND DEADLINES PENDING THE  
OUTCOME OF THE MOTION TO  
TRANSFER AND COORDINATE OR  
CONSOLIDATE PURSUANT TO  
28 U.S.C. § 1407**

WHEREAS, on August 8, 2005, Plaintiff filed the instant action in the Northern  
District of California ("Uwakwe Action");

WHEREAS, on or about July 11, 2005, the plaintiffs in *Brauch, et al. v. Intel  
Corp.*, No. C 05-2743 (BZ) (N. D. Cal., filed July 5, 2005), a related matter, moved before the  
Judicial Panel on Multi-District Litigation ("MDL"), to transfer and coordinate or consolidate for  
pre-trial proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 407 ("MDL Motion"), and the Uwakwe Action has  
been identified as a related action subject to that motion;

1 WHEREAS, on or about August 12, 2005, Judge Patel issued a Related Case  
2 Order relating this case to an earlier filed case assigned to her, and canceling or staying certain  
3 but not all dates, events and deadlines in the action;

4 WHEREAS, to date, a decision has not been rendered on the MDL Motion;

5 WHEREAS, the outcome of the MDL Motion will impact significantly the  
6 schedule of this case;

7 THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED, pursuant to Civil Local Rule 6-2,  
8 by and among counsel for Plaintiff Uwakwe, and counsel for Defendant Intel Corporation, that  
9 any events, dates or deadlines set by the Local Rules or Federal Rules of Civil Procedure,  
10 including the Local Rules for Alternative Dispute Resolution ("ADR Local Rules") and Federal  
11 Rules of Civil Procedure 16 and 26, and any deadlines established in any case management order  
12 applicable to this case should be stayed pending the outcome of the aforementioned MDL  
13 Motion; and

14 IT IS FURTHER STIPULATED by the aforementioned parties that if a case  
15 management conference is rescheduled by the Court, the parties shall adjust the dates for any  
16 conference, disclosures or reports required by the Local Rules or Federal Rules of Civil  
17 Procedure, including the ADR Local Rules and Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 16 and 26  
18 accordingly.

19 IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED.

20 Dated: November 1, 2005

AMAMGBO & ASSOCIATES, APC

21  
22 By: C. Donald Amamgbo  
23 C. Donald Amamgbo  
24 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
25 Athan Uwakwe  
26



1 Dated: November 1, 2005

BINGHAM McCUTCHEN LLP

2  
3 By: Joy K. Fuyuno  
4 Joy K. Fuyuno  
5 Attorneys for Defendant  
6 Intel Corporation  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

**[PROPOSED] ORDER TO STAY DATES, EVENTS AND DEADLINES  
PENDING THE OUTCOME OF THE MDL MOTION**

Any events, dates or deadlines set by the Local Rules or Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, including the Local Rules for Alternative Dispute Resolution ("ADR Local Rules") and Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 16 and 26, and any deadlines established in any case management order applicable to this case are hereby stayed pending the outcome of the motion to transfer and coordinate or consolidate pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407 ("MDL Motion").

Upon the determination of the MDL Motion, if it is necessary for the Court to reschedule a case management conference, the parties shall adjust the dates for any conference, disclosures or reports required by the ADR Local Rules and Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 16 and 26 accordingly.

The parties shall notify the Clerk of Court within 10 days of the decision on the MDL Motion.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: 11/7/05

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Honorable Marilyn H. Patel  
United States District Court Judge

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
JUDICIAL PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION**

**CHAIRMAN:**  
Judge Wm. Terrell Hodges  
United States District Court  
Middle District of Florida

**MEMBERS:**  
Judge John F. Keenan  
United States District Court  
Southern District of New York

Judge D. Lowell Jensen  
United States District Court  
Northern District of California

Judge J. Frederick Motz  
United States District Court  
District of Maryland

Judge Robert L. Miller, Jr.  
United States District Court  
Northern District of Indiana

Judge Kathryn H. Vratil  
United States District Court  
District of Kansas

Judge David R. Hansen  
United States Court of Appeals  
Eighth Circuit

**DIRECT REPLY TO:**

Michael J. Beck  
Clerk of the Panel  
One Columbus Circle, NE  
Thurgood Marshall Federal  
Judiciary Building  
Room G-255, North Lobby  
Washington, D.C. 20002

Telephone: [202] 502-2800  
Fax: [202] 502-2888

<http://www.jpml.uscourts.gov>

November 8, 2005

TO INVOLVED COUNSEL

Re: MDL-1717 -- In re Intel Corp. Microprocessor Antitrust Litigation

(See Attached Schedule A of Order)


Dear Counsel:

I am enclosing a copy of a Panel transfer order filed today in the above-captioned matter.

The Rules of Procedure of the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation, 199 F.R.D. 425 (2001), and specifically, Rules 1.1, 7.4 and 7.5, refer to "tag-along" actions. Please familiarize yourself with these Rules for your future reference. With regard to Rule 7.5, you need only provide this office with a copy of the complaint which you feel qualifies as a "tag-along" action and informally request that our "tag-along" procedures be utilized to transfer the action to the transferee district. If you have any questions regarding procedures used by the Panel, please telephone this office.

Very truly,

Michael J. Beck  
Clerk of the Panel

By   
Deputy Clerk

Enclosure

JPML Form 35

JUDICIAL PANEL ON  
MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

**RELEASED FOR PUBLICATION**

**NOV - 8 2005**

**DOCKET NO. 1717**

**FILED  
CLERK'S OFFICE**

***BEFORE THE JUDICIAL PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION  
IN RE INTEL CORP. MICROPROCESSOR ANTITRUST LITIGATION***

***BEFORE WM. TERRELL HODGES, CHAIRMAN, JOHN F. KEENAN, D.  
LOWELL JENSEN, J. FREDERICK MOTZ, ROBERT L. MILLER, JR.,  
KATHRYN H. VRATIL AND DAVID R. HANSEN, JUDGES OF THE  
PANEL***

***TRANSFER ORDER***

This litigation currently consists of fourteen actions listed on the attached Schedule A and pending in two districts as follows: ten actions in the Northern District of California and four actions in the District of Delaware.<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407, plaintiffs in one Northern District of California action originally moved for centralization of this docket in their California district, but they now favor selection of the District of Delaware as transferee forum. Plaintiff in one of the Delaware actions, Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. (AMD), has stated that it does not object to centralization in the District of Delaware, so long as the Panel orders that AMD's action be allowed to proceed on a separate track within the Section 1407 proceedings. All other responding parties, (i.e, plaintiffs in eight of the nine remaining California actions, the plaintiffs in the three remaining Delaware actions, common defendant Intel Corp., and plaintiffs in various District of Delaware and Northern and Southern District of California potential tag-along actions) support centralization without qualification. With but one exception, all of these additional respondents also support designation of the District of Delaware as transferee forum. The lone dissenter on this point is the plaintiff in a Southern District of California potential tag-along action, who favors centralization in his California district.

On the basis of the papers filed and hearing session held, the Panel finds that the actions in this litigation involve common questions of fact, and that centralization under Section 1407 in the District of Delaware will serve the convenience of the parties and witnesses and promote the just and efficient conduct of the litigation. All actions involve allegations that common defendant Intel Corp. monopolized and unlawfully maintained a monopoly in the market for the microprocessing chips that serve as the "brains" of most modern computers. Centralization under Section 1407 is necessary in order to eliminate duplicative discovery, prevent inconsistent pretrial rulings (especially with respect

---

<sup>1</sup>The Panel has been notified of additional related actions recently filed in the Northern and Southern Districts of California, the District of Delaware, the Southern District of Florida, and the Eastern and Western Districts of Tennessee. In light of the Panel's disposition of this docket, these actions will be treated as potential tag-along actions. See Rules 7.4 and 7.5, R.P.J.P.M.L., 199 F.R.D. 425, 435-36 (2001).

- 2 -

to class certification matters), and conserve the resources of the parties, their counsel and the judiciary. Transfer under Section 1407 will have the salutary effect of placing all actions in this docket before a single judge who can formulate a pretrial program that: i) allows discovery with respect to any non-common issues to proceed concurrently with discovery on common issues, *In re Joseph F. Smith Patent Litigation*, 407 F.Supp. 1403, 1404 (J.P.M.L. 1976); and ii) ensures that pretrial proceedings will be conducted in a manner leading to a just and expeditious resolution of the actions to the benefit of not just some but all of the litigation's parties. We decline to grant AMD's request to issue specific instructions that could limit the discretion of the transferee court to structure this litigation as it sees fit. As Section 1407 proceedings evolve in the transferee district, AMD may wish to renew its argument that the nature of its claims and/or its status as a litigant would warrant separate tracking for its action within the centralized MDL-1717 proceedings. That argument is one to be addressed to the transferee court, however, and not to the Panel.

In concluding that the District of Delaware is an appropriate forum for this docket, we observe that i) the district is an accessible location that is geographically convenient for many of this docket's litigants and counsel; ii) the district is well equipped with the resources that this complex antitrust docket is likely to require; and iii) the district is the near unanimous choice of all responding parties.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407, the actions listed on Schedule A and pending outside the District of Delaware are transferred to that district and, with the consent of that court, assigned to the Honorable Joseph J. Farnan, Jr., for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings with the actions pending there and listed on Schedule A.

FOR THE PANEL:



---

Wm. Terrell Hodges  
Chairman

## SCHEDULE A

### MDL-1717 -- In re Intel Corp. Microprocessor Antitrust Litigation

#### Northern District of California

*David E. Lipton, et al. v. Intel Corp.*, C.A. No. 3:05-2669  
*Maria I. Prohias v. Intel Corp.*, C.A. No. 3:05-2699  
*Ronald Konieczka v. Intel Corp.*, C.A. No. 3:05-2700  
*Patricia M. Niehaus v. Intel Corp.*, C.A. No. 3:05-2720  
*Steve J. Hamilton v. Intel Corp.*, C.A. No. 3:05-2721  
*Michael Brauch, et al. v. Intel Corp.*, C.A. No. 3:05-2743  
*Susan Baxley v. Intel Corp.*, C.A. No. 3:05-2758  
*Huston Frazier, et al. v. Intel Corp.*, C.A. No. 3:05-2813  
*Dwight E. Dickerson v. Intel Corp.*, C.A. No. 3:05-2818  
*The Harman Press v. Intel Corp.*, C.A. No. 3:05-2823

#### District of Delaware

*Advanced Micro Devices, Inc., et al. v. Intel Corp., et al.*, C.A. No. 1:05-441  
*Jim Kidwell, et al. v. Intel Corp.*, C.A. No. 1:05-470  
*Robert J. Rainwater, et al. v. Intel Corp.*, C.A. No. 1:05-473  
*Matthew Kravitz, et al. v. Intel Corp.*, C.A. No. 1:05-476

**FILED**

**JAN - 5 2006**

RICHARD W. WIEKING  
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ATHAN UWAKWE,

No. C 05-03197 MHP

Plaintiff(s),

**ORDER**

v.

INTEL CORPORATION,

Defendant(s).

This matter having been stayed pending other proceedings, and there being no further reason at this time to maintain the file as an open one for statistical purposes, the Clerk is instructed to submit a JS-6 Form to the Administrative Office.

Nothing contained in this minute entry shall be considered a dismissal or disposition of this action and, should further proceedings in this litigation become necessary or desirable, any party may initiate it in the same manner as if this entry had not been entered.

Dated:

  
MARILYN HALL PATEL  
United States District Judge

FILED

05 JAN 10 PM 12:47

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

Peter T. Dalleo  
CLERK

LOCKBOX 18  
844 NORTH KING STREET  
BOGGS FEDERAL BUILDING  
WILMINGTON, DELAWARE 19801  
(302) 573-6170

December 29, 2005

Mr. Richard W. Wieking  
Clerk, U.S. District Court  
United States District Court  
Phillip Burton  
United States Courthouse  
450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36060  
San Francisco, CA 94102-3434

RE: In Re Intel Corporation, Inc., Antitrust Litigation - MDL - 1717

CA 05-2830 (ND/CA) - 05-894 JJF (D/DE)  
CA 05-2831 (ND/CA) - 05-895 JJF (D/DE)  
CA 05-2834 (ND/CA) - 05-896 JJF (D/DE)  
CA 05-2858 (ND/CA) - 05-897 JJF (D/DE)  
CA 05-2859 (ND/CA) - 05-898 JJF (D/DE)  
CA 05-2882 (ND/CA) - 05-899 JJF (D/DE)  
CA 05-2897 (ND/CA) - 05-900 JJF (D/DE)  
CA 05-2898 (ND/CA) - 05-901 JJF (D/DE)  
CA 05-2916 (ND/CA) - 05-902 JJF (D/DE)  
CA 05-2957 (ND/CA) - 05-903 JJF (D/DE)  
CA 05-3028 (ND/CA) - 05-904 JJF (D/DE)  
CA 05-3094 (ND/CA) - 05-905 JJF (D/DE)  
CA 05-3197 (ND/CA) - 05-906 JJF (D/DE)  
CA 05-3271 (ND/CA) - 05-907 JJF (D/DE)  
CA 05-3272 (ND/CA) - 05-908 JJF (D/DE)  
CA 05-3273 (ND/CA) - 05-909 JJF (D/DE)  
CA 05-3277 (ND/CA) - 05-910 JJF (D/DE)

Dear Mr. Wieking:

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1407, enclosed is a certified copy of the *Conditional Order of Transfer* issued by the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation which references the above-captioned case in your District. Kindly forward the complete original file, together with a certified copy of the docket sheet, to the District of Delaware at the following address:



Clerk, U.S. District Court  
Federal Building, Lockbox 18  
844 N. King St.  
Wilmington, DE 19801

If our case file is maintained in electronic format in CM/ECF, please contact Elizabeth Strickler or Monica Mosley at 302-573-6170.


Sincerely,

Peter T. Dalleo, Clerk

By: /s/  
Monica Mosley  
Deputy Clerk

Enc.

cc: Michael Beck, Clerk of Panel



FILED  
COUNTY OF DELAWARE  
JUDICIAL PANEL ON  
MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION  
DOCKET NO. 1717

JUDICIAL PANEL ON  
MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION  
DEC - 6 2005  
FILED  
CLERK'S OFFICE

**BEFORE THE JUDICIAL PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION**  
**IN RE INTEL CORP. MICROPROCESSOR ANTITRUST LITIGATION**  
**(SEE ATTACHED SCHEDULE)**

**CONDITIONAL TRANSFER ORDER (CTO-1)**

On November 8, 2005, the Panel transferred ten civil actions to the United States District Court for the District of Delaware for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407. With the consent of that court, all such actions have been assigned to the Honorable Joseph J. Farnan, Jr.


It appears that the actions on this conditional transfer order involve questions of fact which are common to the actions previously transferred to the District of Delaware and assigned to Judge Farnan.

Pursuant to Rule 7.4 of the Rules of Procedure of the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation, 199 F.R.D. 425, 435-36 (2001), these actions are transferred under 28 U.S.C. § 1407 to the District of Delaware for the reasons stated in the order of November 8, 2005, \_\_\_F.Supp.2d\_\_\_ (J.P.M.L. 2005), and, with the consent of that court, assigned to the Honorable Joseph J. Farnan, Jr.

This order does not become effective until it is filed in the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Delaware. The transmittal of this order to said Clerk shall be stayed fifteen (15) days from the entry thereof and if any party files a notice of opposition with the Clerk of the Panel within this fifteen (15) day period, the stay will be continued until further order of the Panel.

FOR THE PANEL:

Michael J. Beck  
Michael J. Beck  
Clerk of the Panel



**SCHEDULE CTO-1 - TAG-ALONG ACTIONS**  
**DOCKET NO. 1717**  
**IN RE INTEL CORP. MICROPROCESSOR ANTITRUST LITIGATION**

<u>DIST. DIV. C.A. #</u>	<u>CASE CAPTION</u>
<b>CALIFORNIA NORTHERN</b>	
CAN 3 05-2830	Shanghai 1930 Restaurant Partners, L.P. v. Intel Corp.
CAN 3 05-2831	Major League Softball, Inc. v. Intel Corp.
CAN 3 05-2834	Benjamin Allanoff v. Intel Corp.
CAN 3 05-2858	Law Offices of Laurel Stanley, et al. v. Intel Corp.
CAN 3 05-2859	Lazio Family Products v. Intel Corp.
CAN 3 05-2882	Ian Walker v. Intel Corp.
CAN 3 05-2897	Kevin Stoltz v. Intel Corp.
CAN 3 05-2898	Peter Jon Naigo v. Intel Corp.
CAN 3 05-2916	Patrick J. Hewson v. Intel Corp.
CAN 3 05-2957	Lawrence Lang v. Intel Corp.
CAN 3 05-3028	Trotter-Vogel Realty, Inc. v. Intel Corp.
CAN 3 05-3094	Karol Juskiewicz v. Intel Corp.
CAN 3 05-3197	Athan Uwakwe v. Intel Corp.
CAN 3 05-3271	Jose Juan v. Intel Corp.
CAN 3 05-3272	Dressed to Kill Custom Draperies LLC v. Intel Corp.
CAN 3 05-3273	Tracy Kinder v. Intel Corp.
CAN 3 05-3277	Edward Rush v. Intel Corp.
<b>CALIFORNIA SOUTHERN</b>	
CAS 3 05-1507	Justin Suarez v. Intel Corp.
<b>FLORIDA SOUTHERN</b>	
FLS 1 05-22262	Nathaniel Schwartz v. Intel Corp.
<b>KANSAS</b>	
<del>KS 6 05-1303</del>	<del>Marvin D. Chance, Jr. v. Intel Corp., et al. Opposed 12/21/05</del>
<b>TENNESSEE EASTERN</b>	
TNE 2 05-212	Andrew Armbrister, et al. v. Intel Corp.
<b>TENNESSEE WESTERN</b>	
TNW 2 05-2605	Cory Wiles v. Intel Corp.

**INVOLVED COUNSEL LIST (CTO-1)**  
**DOCKET NO. 1717**  
**IN RE INTEL CORP. MICROPROCESSOR ANTITRUST LITIGATION**

Mario N. Alioto  
Trump, Alioto, Trump & Prescott  
2280 Union Street  
San Francisco, CA 94123

Daniel B. Allanoff  
Meredith, Cohen, Greenfogel &  
Skirnick, P.C.  
117 South 17th Street  
22nd Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19103

C. Donald Amangbo  
Amangbo & Associates, PLC  
1940 Embarcadero Cove  
Oakland, CA 94606

Scott Ames  
Serratore & Ames  
9595 Wilshire Blvd.  
Suite 201  
Los Angeles, CA 90212

Russell M. Aoki  
Aoki Sakamoto Grant, LLP  
One Convention Place, Suite 1525  
701 Pike Street  
Seattle, WA 98101

David Mark Balabanian  
Bingham McCutchen LLP  
Three Embarcadero Center  
San Francisco, CA 94111-4067

Gordon Ball  
Ball & Scott  
550 W. Main Avenue  
Bank of America Center  
Suite 750  
Knoxville, TN 37902-2567

Steve W. Berman  
Hagens Berman Sobol Shapiro, LLP  
1301 Fifth Avenue  
Suite 2900  
Seattle, WA 98101

David Boies  
Straus & Boies, LLP  
4041 University Drive, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Fairfax, VA 22030

Craig C. Corbitt  
Zelle, Hofmann, Voelbel, Mason &  
Gette, LLP  
44 Montgomery Street, Suite 3400  
San Francisco, CA 94104

Robert W. Coykendall  
Morris, Laing, Evans, Brock &  
Kennedy, Chld.  
Old Town Square  
300 North Mead  
Suite 200  
Wichita, KS 67202-2722

Donald F. Drummond  
Drummond & Associates  
One California Street  
Suite 300  
San Francisco, CA 94111

Jef Feibelman  
Burch, Porter & Johnson, PLLC  
130 N. Court Ave.  
Memphis, TN 38103

Nancy L. Fineman  
Cotchett, Pitre, Simon & McCarthy  
San Francisco Airport Office Center  
Suite 200  
840 Malcolm Road  
Burlingame, CA 94010

Barbara C. Frankland  
Gunderson, Sharp & Walke, L.L.P.  
4121 West 83rd Street  
Suite 256  
Prairie Village, KS 66208

Joy K. Fuyuno  
Bingham McCutchen LLP  
Three Embarcadero Center  
San Francisco, CA 94111-4067

Harvey W. Gurland, Jr.  
Duane Morris  
200 South Biscayne Blvd.  
Suite 3400  
Miami, FL 33131

Lance A. Harke  
Harke & Clasby LLP  
155 South Miami Avenue  
Suite 600  
Miami, FL 33130

Christopher B. Hockett  
Bingham McCutchen LLP  
Three Embarcadero Center  
San Francisco, CA 94111-4067

Jeffrey F. Keller  
Law Offices of Jeffrey F. Keller  
425 Second Street  
Suite 500  
San Francisco, CA 94107

Michael L. Kirby  
Post, Kirby, Noonan & Sweat  
701 B Street  
Suite 1100  
San Diego, CA 92101-3302

Jerry W. Laughlin  
Rogers, Laughlin, Nunnally, Hood &  
Crum  
100 South Main Street  
Greenville, TN 37743

Michael P. Lehmann  
Furth Firm, LLP  
225 Bush Street  
Suite 1500  
San Francisco, CA 94104-4249

Ali Oromchian  
Finkelstein, Thompson & Loughran  
601 Montgomery Street  
Suite 665  
San Francisco, CA 94111

Joseph M. Patane  
Law Offices of Joseph Patane  
2280 Union Street  
San Francisco, CA 94123

Donald L. Perelman  
Fine, Kaplan & Black, RPC  
1835 Market Street  
28th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Juden Justice Reed  
Schubert & Reed, LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Suite 1050  
San Francisco, CA 94111

Randy R. Renick  
Law Offices of Randy Renick  
128 North Fair Oaks Ave.  
Suite 204  
Pasadena, CA 91103

Richard A. Ripley  
Bingham McCutchen  
1120 20th Street, N.W.  
Suite 800  
Washington, DC 20036

INVOLVED COUNSEL LIST (CTO-1) MDL-1717

PAGE 2 OF 2

R. Alexander Saveri  
Saveri & Saveri, Inc.  
111 Pine Street  
Suite 1700  
San Francisco, CA 94111-5630

Francis O. Scarpulla  
Law Offices of Francis O. Scarpulla  
44 Montgomery Street  
Suite 3400  
San Francisco, CA 94104

Reginald Von Terrell  
Terrell Law Group  
223 25th Street  
Richmond, CA 94804

Douglas G. Thompson, Jr.  
Finkelstein, Thompson & Loughran  
1055 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W.  
Suite 601  
Washington, DC 20007

B. J. Wade  
Glassman, Edwards, Wade & Wyatt, P.C.  
26 North Second Street  
Memphis, TN 38103

Edward A. Wallace  
Wexler Law Firm  
One North LaSalle Street  
Suite 2000  
Chicago, IL 60602

**INVOLVED JUDGES LIST (CTO-1)  
DOCKET NO. 1717  
IN RE INTEL CORP. MICROPROCESSOR ANTITRUST LITIGATION**

Hon. J. Daniel Breen  
U.S. District Judge  
345 U.S. Courthouse  
111 South Highland Avenue  
Jackson, TN 38301

Hon. J. Ronnie Greer  
U.S. District Judge  
United States District Court  
220 West Depot Street  
Suite 405  
Greeneville, TN 37743

~~Hon. J. Thomas Marten  
U.S. District Judge  
232 U.S. Courthouse  
401 North Market St.  
Wichita, KS 67202~~

Hon. Jose E. Martinez  
U.S. District Judge  
Federal Courthouse Square  
Third Floor  
301 North Miami Avenue  
Miami, FL 33128

Hon. Marilyn Hall Patel  
U.S. District Judge  
Phillip Burton U.S. Courthouse  
Box 36060  
450 Golden Gate Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102-3661

Hon. Thomas J. Whelan  
U.S. District Judge  
3155 Edward J. Schwartz U.S. Courthouse  
940 Front Street, Suite 3155  
San Diego, CA 92101

**INVOLVED CLERKS LIST (CTO-1)**  
**DOCKET NO. 1717**  
**IN RE INTEL CORP. MICROPROCESSOR ANTITRUST LITIGATION**

Clarence Maddox, Clerk  
Federal Courthouse Square  
301 North Miami Avenue  
Miami, FL 33128-7788

Patricia L. McNutt, Clerk  
U.S. Courthouse  
101 Summer Street, West  
Greenville, TN 37743

~~Ralph L. DeLoach, Clerk~~  
~~204 U.S. Courthouse~~  
~~401 N. Market Street~~  
~~Wichita, KS 67202~~

Richard W. Wieking, Clerk  
400-S Ronald V. Dellums  
Federal Building  
1301 Clay Street  
Oakland, CA 94612-5212

Richard W. Wieking, Clerk  
Phillip Burton U.S. Courthouse  
Box 36060  
450 Golden Gate Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102-3489

Thomas M. Gould, Clerk  
242 Clifford Davis Federal Building  
167 North Main Street  
Memphis, TN 38103

W. Samuel Hamrick, Jr., Clerk  
4290 Edward J. Schwartz Federal Building  
880 Front Street  
San Diego, CA 92101-8900

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
Northern District of California  
450 Golden Gate Avenue  
San Francisco, California 94102

[www.cand.uscourts.gov](http://www.cand.uscourts.gov)

Richard W. Wicking  
Clerk

General Court Number  
415.522.2000

January 11, 2006

United States District Court  
for the District of Delaware  
Lockbox 18  
844 North King Street  
Boggs Federal Building  
Wilmington, Delaware 19801

RE: **In Re Intel Corporation, Inc., Antitrust Litigation - MDL - 1717**

CV 05-2830 MHP **05-894 JJF (D/DE)**  
CV 05-2831 MHP **05-895 JJF (D/DE)**  
CV 05-2834 MHP **05-896 JJF (D/DE)**  
CV 05-2858 MHP **05-897 JJF (D/DE)**  
CV 05-2859 MHP **05-898 JJF (D/DE)**  
CV 05-2882 MHP **05-899 JJF (D/DE)**  
CV 05-2897 MHP **05-900 JJF (D/DE)**  
CV 05-2898 MHP **05-901 JJF (D/DE)**  
CV 05-2916 MHP **05-902 JJF (D/DE)**  
CV 05-2957 MHP **05-903 JJF (D/DE)**  
CV 05-3028 MHP **05-904 JJF (D/DE)**  
CV 05-3094 MHP **05-905 JJF (D/DE)**  
CV 05-3197 MHP **05-906 JJF (D/DE)**  
CV 05-3271 MHP **05-907 JJF (D/DE)**  
CV 05-3272 MHP **05-908 JJF (D/DE)**  
CV 05-3273 MHP **05-909 JJF (D/DE)**  
CV 05-3277 MHP **05-910 JJF (D/DE)**

Dear Clerk,

Pursuant to an order transferring the above captioned cases to your court, transmitted herewith are:

- (✓) Certified copy of docket entries
- (✓) Certified copy of TRANSFERRAL ORDER
- (✓) Original case file documents
- (✓) Please be advised that the above entitled action was previously designated to the

Electronic Case Filing program. You can access electronically filed documents through PACER referencing the Northern District of California case number at <https://ecf.cand.uscourts.gov>

Please acknowledge receipt of the above documents on the attached copy of this letter.



Sincerely,  
RICHARD W. WIEKING, Clerk

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Gina Agustine". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

by: Gina Agustine-Rivas  
Case Systems Administrator

Enclosures  
Copies to counsel of record